

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

VIVIAN BURNS,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS  
MACHINES CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. C20-1555RSM

MINUTE ORDER

The following MINUTE ORDER is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez, United States District Judge: This case has been closed since November 2021. On January 25, 2022, the Court stated it “will not consider further memoranda or declarations filed in this case that attempt to argue the merits of [Plaintiff’s] dismissed claims.” Dkt. #61 at 2. The Court has denied Rule 59 and Rule 60 motions and a motion for reconsideration filed by Plaintiff. Dkts. #57 and #64. On March 3, 2022, the Court struck Plaintiff’s “2nd Motion for Substantive Due Process and Evidentiary Hearing” as duplicative. Dkt. #66. In that Minute Order, the Court stated it “will continue to strike further filings in this case that attempt to argue the merits of Plaintiff’s dismissed claims or which seek relief that has already been denied.” On March 10, 2022, the Court struck Plaintiff’s “Motion for Declaratory

1 Judgment” via Minute Order. Dkt. #70. The Court warned that “future filings presented for an  
2 improper purpose or with frivolous legal contentions may result in sanctions under Federal Rule  
3 of Civil Procedure 11.” *Id.*

4 On March 18, 2022, the Court received a “Complaint” from Plaintiff with the case number  
5 C20-1555 RSM in the caption. It was initially unclear if Plaintiff was seeking to open a new  
6 case. Further review indicated that this was a “complaint” to the Court about issues in the instant  
7 case. The filing sought recusal of Judge Martinez in this or perhaps a future case filed by  
8 Plaintiff. Plaintiff reargued the merits of her claims and prior discovery issues. Plaintiff did not  
9 cite to any law or rules permitting her requested relief in a closed case. The Court, by Minute  
10 Order, struck the “Complaint” as moot. Dkt. #72.

13 On March 31, 2022, Plaintiff filed a “Motion to Vacate Void Judgment for Lack of  
14 Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Personal Jurisdiction.” Dkt. #73. The Court found the filing  
15 frivolous, untimely, and moot, and struck it via Minute Order. Dkt. #74.

16 On September 26, 2022, Ms. Burns filed a 16-page “Motion to Show Cause Why  
17 Defendant Should Have Summary Judgment Contrary to Law.” Dkt. #75. Ms. Burns addressed  
18 the merits of her case, repeated previously made arguments, and raised alleged rule-violations  
19 that the Court found to be frivolous, untimely, and moot. The Court struck the filing via Minute  
20 Order and stated that it would “continue to strike any filing by Ms. Burns that attempts to argue  
21 the merits of her dismissed claims or which seeks relief that has already been denied.” Dkt. #78.

24 Ms. Burns appealed that Minute Order to the Ninth Circuit. Dkt. #79. On June 30, 2023,  
25 the appeal was dismissed as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Dkt. #84. The Ninth  
26 Circuit did not provide any new basis for Ms. Burns to continue with the instant case.

1 Four months later, Ms. Burns has now filed an “Answer of Non-Frivolous Lawsuit,” a  
2 “Motion to Continue with the Title VII Lawsuit for Ongoing Age and Disability Discrimination,”  
3 and a “Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis.” Dkts. #86 through #88. All three  
4 include the instant case number and attempt to argue the merits of her dismissed claims or to  
5 seeks relief that has already been denied.  
6

7 Given all of the above, the Court now STRIKES these filings as duplicative and moot.  
8 Ms. Burns has no proper reason to continue filing materials in this closed case.  
9

10 DATED this 1st day of November, 2023.  
11

12 RAVI SUBRAMANIAN, Clerk

13 By: /s/ Serge Bodnarchuk  
14 Deputy Clerk  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28